Remarks

Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. Claims 1-9 and 17 are being amended. Support for these claim amendments can be found at least on page 3, lines 1-11 and page 11, lines 23-25 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants submit no new matter is being introduced by way of this Amendment. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and objections. Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,997) hereinafter "Wu", in view of Khakoo et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0135569) hereinafter "Khakoo", and further in view of Polcyn (U.S. Patent No. 7,054,918).

Applicants believe a brief overview of an example embodiment would be helpful. In an example embodiment, an apparatus may comprise a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. Applicants believe none of the cited references disclose the feature of a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application as recited in Claim 1 ("…a processor configured to receive, from an application, a request for an identity of a user…").

Wu discloses an Internet-capable appliance for sending a request to a Password-All Portal system, but does not provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. More specifically, Wu discloses a method for a subscribing user operating an Internet-capable appliance. The Internet-capable appliance may gain access to a webpage, via an Internet Service Provider (ISP), which in turn provides access to any one of a number of servers on Internet (Wu, Col. 5, lines 37-44). Thus, Wu merely provides an Internet-capable appliance sending (not receiving) a request to a Password-All Portal to connect to servers. In other words, Wu does not teach a request for an identity of a user let alone provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application.

Khakoo discloses an instant delivery server to update a presence database with user information, but does not provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. In particular, Khakoo provides an instant message delivery server, which maintains a presence database. The presence database records information for each user in the community. In use, the instant message delivery server updates the database based on the automatic detection of the presence of the user or by a process of manual registration by the user (Khakoo, paragraph [0021]). In this way, the instant delivery server updates user information on the presence database. Therefore, Khakoo cannot teach receiving a request for an identity of a user let alone provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application.

Polcyn discloses a translator to extract user data to facilitate communication, but does not provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. More specifically, Polcyn discloses an electronic calendar application, which allows a user to select, for example, a specific day. The calendar application then displays a chronological list of events for the chosen day. A translator may provide a data interface between the electronic calendar application and voice mail or call processing system by extracting user information from a database. Upon extracting information from the database, the translator reformats the data into a format that can be used by a communication system, such as a voice mail or call processing system (Polcyn, Col. 5, line 45 – col. 6, line 21). In this way, Polcyn discloses a translator to extract data to facilitate communication, but does not disclose a request for an identity of a user. Even assuming Polcyn did disclose receiving a request, which it does not (Polcyn extracts data) Polcyn does not disclose a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application.

Accordingly, Wu, Khakoo, and, Polcyn, either taken separately or in combination do not teach or suggest the claim feature of "a processor is configured to receive, from an application, a request for an identity of a user" as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from Claim 1 so they too should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Moreover, since Wu, Khakoo, and, Polcyn, fundamentally operate by obtaining data without a request from an application. Thus, one of ordinary skill would have no motivation to modify the Wu, Khakoo, or, Polcyn references to receive an identify of a user from an application.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claims 10-12 and 14-16 depend from Claim 9 and Claims 18-20 and 22-24 depend from Claim 18, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 5, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Khakoo, further in view of Polcyn, and still further view of Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,593) hereinafter "Gabber."

Gabber discloses an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. In particular, Gabber provides a central proxy system with computer-executable routines. The central proxy system processes site-specific substitute identifiers constructed from data specific to users. The central proxy system transmits the substitute identifiers to the server sites, which re-transmits browsing commands received from the users to the server sites (Gabber, Abstract). In this way, Gabber provides an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not teach a request for an identify of a user let alone provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application.

Thus, Gabber does not add the missing claimed feature of "a processor configured to receive, from an application, a request for an identity of a user" to Wu, Khakoo, or Polcyn as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 so it too should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claim 13 depends from Claim 9 and Claim 21 depends from Claim 17, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

It is clear from the foregoing that the claims are in condition for allowance. An early formal notice of allowance of claims is respectfully requested. Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment that may be due in this matter to Deposit Account Number 50-0270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas J. Arria/

Thomas J. Arria
Registration No. 60,223

Date: September 29, 2008

NOKIA, INC.
Intellectual Property Rights
ATTN: Docketing
6021 Connection Drive, MS 2-5-520
Irving, Texas 75039

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.

/Denise Wilson/
Signed

September 29, 2008
Date